P.O. Box 792653
New Orleans, LA 70179

May 29, 2006

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ATTN: Mr. Michael Lee, Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622

Commissioner or Mr. Lee:

I, William Redvers Belisle, sole inventor regarding patent application number 10/820,268 filed 04/08/2004, am responding to the USPTO Office communication date mailed 04/21/2006. I am providing the attached information (6 page document) to the USPTO as my response.

My permanent address is 7901 Lafourche Street, New Orleans, Louisiana. I was a displaced evacuee from New Orleans as a result of hurricane Katrina. There is no U.S. Postal Service in my neighborhood. I have recently submitted appropriate address change information and documentation to the USPTO for my present mailing address shown at the top of this communication. Please forward any communications to P.O. Box 792653, New Orleans, LA 70179. My contacts information is 504.858.1316 cell and wrbelisle@cs.com.

Mr. Lee, thank you for your understanding of my situation and your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

William Redvers Belisle
Sole Inventor

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility, and the discussion of a compensation lens being placed close to the eyes such that the closeness is approximately the length of the compensation lens focal point which is less than an inch or two, Chapman, Bill. *Coping with Vision Loss.* Hunter House Inc.: 2001. Page 141. states "By definition, a +1 D lens focuses light at one meter. One meter equals about 40 in. The formula for determining the focal length of any lens is: 40/D. = inches of the focal length. The focal length of a +10 D lens = 40/10 = 4 in." Hence, an eyeglass focal length of 1.0 meter. Cutnell, John D. and Johnson, Kenneth W. *Physics: Fourth Edition.* Wiley, 1998: 811 state "Refractive power of a lens (D) = 1 / F (focal length in meters) ...Converging lenses have a refractive power of 1 diopter if it focuses parallel light rays to a focal point 1 m beyond the lens." Hence, an eyeglass focal length of 1.0 meter. Regarding a viewer with abnormal vision, a corrective lens or film in front of the television within a focal length of one meter (for example) may correct the vision of the viewer. Considering a wide range of focal lengths, including "lens placed close to the eyes", in order for abnormal vision to be corrected, the viewer's eye(s) must be appropriately positioned relative to the correction lens or film, i.e. at an appropriate focal length. The viewer may be required to be positioned close to the corrective lens or film, or positioned for or at an appropriate focal length, including focal lengths less than an inch or two, or up to 1 meter, in order for the corrective lens or film to correct abnormal vision. The correction lens or film must also be appropriately positioned relative to the television viewing surface. Considering claim 9 of the present application, where the television screen or viewing surface includes or receives the correction prescription, the viewer, or the viewer's eyes, would only need to be appropriately positioned relative to the corrective lens or film (which in this case is the television screen itself) or positioned for or at an appropriate focal length relative to the corrective lens or film in order for abnormal vision to be corrected. Considering the statement in your communication "Similarly, by manipulating the television signal itself would not correct the viewer's abnormal vision because the image would appear out of focus without a proper pair of eyeglasses.", a manipulated television signal would appear in focus and would correct a viewer's abnormal vision if the correction lens or film was positioned at an appropriate focal point from the viewer or the viewer's eyes as the viewer viewed the received television signal on the screen. To a certain degree, the correction lens or film may be considered as taking the place of the eyeglasses referred to in your statement. The focal lengths may vary from approximately an inch or two in conventional eyeglasses, or up to 1.0 meter for example. In addition, Crick and Khaw. *A Textbook of Clinical Ophthalmology, 2nd Edition.* World Scientific, 1997: 55 describe focal lengths of 0.5 meter and state "The power of a lens is measured in diopters (D), the diopter being the reciprocal of the focal length in meters. Thus a 1 D lens has a focal length of 1 meter, while a 2 D lens has a focal length of 0.5 meter." Considering the above referenced eyeglass focal lengths as being different from the eyeglass focal lengths described in your Office Communication

"less than an inch or two", the disclosure is considered enabling and the claimed invention is supported by a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility. Considering the above referenced eyeglass focal lengths, the discussion about the relative positioning of the viewer or the viewer's eyes to the position of the correction lens, film, or prescription screen (i.e. the correction lens, film, or prescription screen positioned at an appropriate focal length), and regarding the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 35 U.S.C. 112, the claimed invention is supported by a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility and is considered enabling.

Regarding your statement "By placing a correction lens or film in front of the television screen as in the instant invention, the abnormal vision of the viewer cannot be corrected because the correction lens or film is way out of focal length.", the focal length is dependent upon the position of the television viewer's eyes relative to the device described in the present application, upon the position of the device relative to the position of the television screen or viewing surface *if the device is not positioned within the television screen or viewing surface itself. If the latter is the case, then the focal length is dependent upon the position of the viewer's eyes relative to the position of the television screen. Regarding the present application, and regarding claim 9 of the present application, the viewer's eyes may be positioned optimally relative to the prescription television screen for optimal focal length. Regarding the device being positioned between the viewer and the television screen, appropriate focal lengths are achieved when the viewer's eye(s) are positioned optimally relative to the device and the device is positioned optimally relative to the television screen such that optimum focal lengths are provided for television viewing. Considering the information and references in this document, the viewer's eye(s) may be positioned less than about one-quarter inch, greater than about eight and one-half inches, about one-quarter inch to eight and one-half inches (other than with a Fresnel lens located about four and one-half inches from said viewing screen and said plano-convex lens having a thickness of about three and one-half inches (lens thickness ranging from approximately zero inches to six inches with varying focal lengths)), or greater than about eight and one-half inches from the device for appropriate focal length to be achieved AND the device may be positioned about one-quarter inch, greater than about eight and one-half inches, about one-quarter inch to eight and one-half inches (other than with a Fresnel lens located about four and one-half inches from said viewing screen and said plano-convex lens having a thickness of about three and one-half inches (lens thickness ranging from approximately zero inches to six inches with varying focal lengths)) or greater than about eight and one-half inches from/relative to the television screen for appropriate focal length to be achieved.

Regarding your statement "Similarly, by manipulating the television signal itself would not correct the viewer's abnormal vision because the image would appear out of focus without a proper pair of eyeglasses.", the eyeglass prescription device described in the present application may be positioned at an appropriate

distance from the viewer's eye(s) and hence at an appropriate focal length, and at an appropriate distance from the television screen in order for the image to be in focus for the viewer. The eyeglass prescription device described in the present application may be either a) viewed as taking the place of a 'proper pair of eyeglasses' (positioned at an appropriate distance from the viewer's eyes), b) viewed as taking the place of a 'proper pair of eyeglasses' (positioned at an appropriate distance from the viewer's eyes) with a prescription allowing appropriate viewing of the image of the manipulated television signal, or c) be used in conjunction with the eyeglasses to contribute to the image appearing in focus and thus be viewed as contributing to the affect of the eyeglass prescription. Note that the eyeglasses may or may not have the correct prescription for optimal viewing by the viewer when eyeglasses are used in conjunction with the prescription device in the present application. The paragraph above also addresses the appropriate positioning of the device relative to the viewer's eye(s). Regarding this discussion, the disclosure is considered enabling.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 112 and considering the above discussion, the claimed invention is supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility, and one skilled in the art clearly would know how to use the claimed invention.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-4, 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DeJesus (5,061,052), and regarding each of the lens being made according to a focal length of prescription as claimed, the DeJesus focal lengths not varying, the DeJesus claim 3, the enhancing system (including the DeJesus focal lengths described), being detachable from the television screen (including the DeJesus focal lengths described), regarding claim 9 (as discussed in your communication), and regarding your communication "...(note col.7, line 67, to col. 8, line 10).", the focal lengths described by DeJesus are "between two inches and four inches", and "said Fresnel lens is located about four and one-half inches from said viewing screen and said plano-convex lens has a thickness of about three and one-half inches" (lens thickness ranging from approximately zero inches to six inches with varying focal lengths). The present patent application includes focal lengths of up to 1 meter or 40 inches or so which are different from the focal lengths described by DeJesus (between two and four inches). The present patent application includes focal lengths other than those described by DeJesus. The present patent application does not claim or describe the use of a plano-convex lens and a Fresnel lens (two lenses in front of the viewing screen) to enhance television viewing as does DeJesus. DeJesus describes "A spacing of the smooth Fresnel lens surface 26 from the viewing screen 14 of about four and one-half inches is the preferred spacing for a plano-convex lens 16 of this size". The present application does not describe a spacing of the smooth Fresnel lens surface 26 from the viewing screen 14 of about four and one-half inches is the preferred spacing for a plano-convex lens 16 of this size. Nor does the present patent application describe a radius of curvature of the convex

surface 20 is preferably twelve and one-half inches for a lens of thickness T equal to three and one-half inches as does DeJesus. Regarding the DeJesus patent being detachable from the television screen (including the DeJesus focal lengths described), the present patent application includes detachable from the television screen regarding focal lengths of up to 1 meter or 40 inches or so which are different to the focal lengths described by DeJesus (between two and four inches). The present patent application includes detachable from the television screen regarding focal lengths other than those described by DeJesus and the additional information in this paragraph and communication. Regarding claim 9 of the present patent application, DeJesus does not describe or claim a television picture or image enhancing system comprising a television screen which may exist alone as a prescription television signal receiver and viewing surface only as does the present patent application.

Regarding DeJesus and claims 1-4, 9 rejection, claim 1 and (and maybe/maybe not claim 9) of the present application may require the inclusion of "including focal lengths other than between two and four inches", "excluding the use of two lenses (a plano-convex and a Fresnel together)" including "Fresnel lens located about four and one-half inches from said viewing screen and said plano-convex lens having a thickness of about three and one-half inches (lens thickness ranging from approximately zero inches to six inches with varying focal lengths)" at the end of claims 1 and 9 for further clarification of the difference between the DeJesus patent and the present application.

In response to the rejections of claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens (6,018,339), a television is defined as "a system for transmitting images and sound by converting them into electrical or radio waves which are converted back into images and sound by a receiver". Synonyms for television include TV, box, tube, and small screen. A computer is defined as "a programmable electronic device that can store, retrieve, and process data". Synonyms for computer include processor, CPU, central processing unit, mainframe, supercomputer, workstation, PC, laptop, and notebook (The Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2004). Stevens claims and describes, and includes in col. 3, line 64, to col. 4, line 9, and lines 20-37, improved television display for a computer and computer screen. I am claiming, in the present patent application, improved television viewing for a television and television screen. The present application claims and descriptions are different from the Stevens claims and descriptions. Stevens also describes "For example, if the computer were preset for user's having 2-020 vision, identifying a user as having 20-400 vision might cause the computer to automatically increase the size of the indicia by two or three times so that the particular user could then view the computer screen in substantially the same manner as a person with 20-20 vision." The components of an eyeglass prescription include a) the base (spherical) strength and type (plus or minus), b) the cylinder strength and type, c) the cylinder axis orientation, and d) the strength of bifocal segment (if required) as stated in the present application. The present application does not improve television image

or picture perception by only magnifying or increasing the size of the image or picture by two or three times as does Stevens. The present application improves television image or picture perception by providing the correct/appropriate eyeglass prescription for the viewer with the prescription including a) the base (spherical) strength and type (plus or minus), b) the cylinder strength and type, c) the cylinder axis orientation, and d) the strength of bifocal segment (if required) which is different from Stevens. Eyeglass prescriptions, including the eyeglass prescriptions in the present application, do not contain only magnification, including only magnification by two or three factors as described as "prescription" by Stevens. Stevens description of focusing for eyeglass prescriptions includes magnification of the image by two or three factors and the description of eyeglass prescription in the present application includes the components a) the base (spherical) strength and type (plus or minus), b) the cylinder strength and type, c) the cylinder axis orientation, and d) the strength of bifocal segment (if required). Stevens also describes "Thus, the system also has the capability of storing information relating to the focusing of the image. This is done through the block shown schematically at 28." The present application does not claim or describe the storing of information relating to the focusing of the image. Stevens also describes a computer program for incorporating certain criteria relating to a user's eyesight and increasing the size of the indicia by two or three times for improved viewing. The present application does not describe computer programs or the incorporation of certain criteria relating to a user's eyesight and increasing the indicia by two or three times for improved viewing.

In response to the rejection of Claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens (6,018,339), and regarding claim 5, including col. 3, line 64 to col. 4 line 9, and lines 20-37 of Stevens, Stevens discloses a device for controlling the focus of the television image on a computer screen in accordance with the eyesight or prescription of the viewer and the computer monitor is intended to display different video signals, such as television or computer video signals. This is different from the present patent application. The present patent application discloses a device for controlling the variation of the perception as in a prescription for vision of the pictures or images on a television screen or from a television screen through broadcasted television signal manipulation. The viewing surface in Stevens is a computer screen and the viewing surface in the present application is a television screen. Stevens' disclosure concerns the viewing of a computer screen and the present patent application concerns the viewing of a television screen. Because of the difference between the Stevens patent and the present application, the information in this paragraph therefore also addresses the rejection of claims 6, 7, and 8. Regarding the rejection of claims 7 and 8, Stevens describes a device that can be detached or attached to the system concerning a computer screen. The present application describes a device that may or may not be attached to the system concerning a television screen.

In response to Blum (4,929,865) showing an eye comfort panel, Blum describes "This invention relates to an eye comfort panel or faceplate for a cathode ray tube computer terminal.". Blum is aware of various applications of the use of cathode ray tubes as Blum describes "Most improvements of the video display terminals (VDT) and other cathode ray tube applications have focused on increased image clarity ...". Blum describes "The computer terminal 10 has a cathode ray tube 12 on which characters, lines, ...". Blum also claims "an eye comfort device for optically adjusting the focal point distance for screen viewing....". Focal point adjustment, as claimed and described by Blum, is only one important factor in eyeglass prescriptions as well as in appropriate vision associated with eyeglass prescriptions. The present application claims and describes the variation of the perception (versus the variation of the focal point only) as in prescription for vision. Blum describes "In the common use of computer terminals, a key-board operator keys in data, and the characters input, as well as character or other output is displayed on the screen." Blum also describes "...computer operations...", "...operation of computer video display terminals...", operators positioned at the terminal during most of their working day,...", and "...individuals at the workstation,...". In the description of drawings, Blum describes "... the keyboard display terminal showing my eye comfort device." Blum claims and describes an eye comfort device for optically adjusting the focal distance for screen viewing of a video display for and involving a cathode ray tube computer terminal. Blum does not claim or describe a device or system for television or television screens as does the present application. The present patent application claims and describes a device which varies or allows the variation of the perception as in a prescription for vision of the pictures or images on or from a television screen.